

CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

Existing Conditions

Introduction

This component of the Growth Policy is the Lewis and Clark County Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The CFP lays out a long-term strategy for facilities like roads, sewer lines, and fire stations, items which generally have very long useful lives, significant costs, and are not mobile.

The focus of the CFP is to plan for needed public facilities for current and future population growth, including the facilities provided by the County government, special districts, and other public sector agencies. The purpose of the CFP is to provide adequate public facilities as defined by level of service standards (LOS) for each type of capital facility.

CFP Source Documents

The source documents primarily used in preparing this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are capital improvement plans prepared routinely, and updated annually as required by the State, and which are necessary for obtaining funding from the State. These individual capital improvement plans define projects and proposed funding for those projects required first to rehabilitate existing facilities and, secondly, to provide level of service (LOS) capacity to accommodate new growth in the County.

The proposed new capital facility capacity, replacement, rehabilitation, and financing for 2000-2004 in this CFP reflects the general direction in other longer-range County planning documents. The information in this CFP is based on a variety of plans that may have been prepared using different assumptions. If there are inconsistencies it is because the source documents were prepared independently. Appendix N contains a list of County documents and planning documents prepared by other facilities providers that were used in preparing this CFP.

The process described above, combined with the level of service (LOS) methodology (used to identify the requirements for and affordability of future capital facilities) constitutes the total capital facilities planning process. This process enables the County to make more informed decisions about its investment of public dollars, as well as more timely decisions about maintaining levels of service in accordance with this CFP.

Definition and Purpose of the CFP

The CFP is a five-year plan (2000-2004) for capital improvements that support Lewis and Clark County's current and future population and economy. The capital improvements included in the capital facility plan will be fully funded (i.e., not a "wish list"). One of the principal criteria for identifying needed capital improvements is using standards for levels of service (LOS). The CFP contains LOS standards for many public facilities, and requires that new development be served by adequate facilities. The CFP also contains broad goals and specific policies that guide and implement the provision of adequate public facilities.

The purpose of the CFP is to use sound fiscal policies to provide adequate public facilities consistent with the land use plan and concurrent with, or prior to the impacts of development in order to achieve and maintain adopted standards for levels of service, and to exceed the adopted standards, when possible.

Why Plan for Capital Facilities?

The CFP is the component that makes the rest of the Growth Policy complete, in that it deals with tangible items that can have a significant impact on County residents. By establishing levels of service as the basis for providing capital facilities, the CFP determines the quality of life in the community. Balancing the capital costs and revenues in the CFP provides a reality check on the vision set forth in the Growth Policy.

Capital facilities plans are included in the Growth Policy in order to:

- Provide capital facilities for land development that is envisioned or authorized by the land use plan.
- Maintain the quality of life for existing and future development by establishing and maintaining standards for capital facility level of service.
- Coordinate and provide consistency among the many plans for capital improvements including other portions of the Growth Policy (i.e., transportation and utilities); master plans and other studies of the local government; plans for capital facilities of state and/or regional significance; plans of other adjacent local governments; and plans of special districts.
- Insure the timely provision of adequate facilities.
- Demonstrate the need for facilities and the need for revenues to pay for them.

- Take advantage of sources of revenue (e.g., grants and loans) that require a CFP in order to qualify for the revenue.
- Get better ratings on bond issues when the County borrows money for capital facilities (thus reducing interest rates and the cost of borrowing money).

Levels of Service as the Basis for Determining Needed Capital Facilities

Levels of service are usually quantifiable measures of the amount of public facilities that are provided to the community. Levels of service may also measure the quality of some public facilities. Typically, measures of levels of service are expressed as ratios of facility capacity to demand (i.e., actual or potential users). Each of the level of service measures needs one additional piece of information: The specific quantity that measures the current or proposed level of service. For example, the *standard* for parks might be 5 acres per 1,000 population, but the *current* level of service may be 2.68 acres per 1,000, which is less than the standard.

In order to make use of the level of service method, the County selects the way in which it will measure each facility (i.e., acres, gallons, etc.), and it identifies the amount of the current and proposed (i.e., standard) level of service for each measurement.

There are other ways to measure the level of service of many of these capital facilities. The examples shown above are provided in order to give greater depth to the following discussion of the use of levels of service as a method for determining the County's need for capital facilities.

Method for Using Levels of Service

The level of service method answers two questions in order for the County to develop a financially feasible approach to meet its capital needs for the 5-year planning period 2000-2004.

1. What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of the 5th year (i.e., 2004)?
2. Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of the 5th year (i.e., 2004)?

The answer to each question can be calculated by using objective data and formulas. Each type of public facility is examined separately (i.e., roads are examined separately

from parks). The costs of all the types of facilities are then added together in order to determine the overall financial feasibility of the CFP.

Section III of the CFP contains the results of the use of this method to answer the two questions for Lewis and Clark County.

Question 1. What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of the 5th year (i.e., 2004)?

Formula 1.21	Demand	X	Standard	=	Requirement
--------------	--------	---	----------	---	-------------

Where: Demand is the estimated 2004 population or other appropriate measure of need.

And: Standard is the amount of facility per unit of demand (i.e., acres of park per capita).

The answer to this formula is the total amount of public facilities that are needed, regardless of the amount of facilities that are already in place and being used by the public.

Formula 1.2:	Requirement	-	Inventory	=	Surplus or Deficiency
--------------	-------------	---	-----------	---	-----------------------

Where: Requirement is the result of Formula 1.1,

And: Inventory is the quantity of facilities available as of June 30, 1999.

This formula uses the inventory of existing public facilities to offset the total requirement of Formula 1.1. The answer to Formula 1.2 is the net surplus of public facilities, or the net deficiency that must be eliminated by additional facilities before June 30, 2004. If a net deficiency exists, it represents the combined needs of existing development and anticipated new development. Detailed analysis will reveal the portion of the net deficiency that is attributable to current development compared to the portion needed for new development.

Question 2. Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of the 5th year (i.e., 2004)?

The demonstration of financial feasibility uses detailed costs of specific capital projects as follows:

Formula 2.1:	Capacity Projects	+	Non-Capacity Projects	=	Project Cost
--------------	-------------------	---	-----------------------	---	--------------

Where: Capacity project in the table above is the cost of all projects needed to eliminate the deficiency for existing and future development (Formula 1.2), including upgrades and/or expansion of existing facilities as well as new facilities.

And: Non-capacity projects is the cost of remodeling, renovation or replacement needed to maintain the inventory of existing facilities.

Formula 2.2:	Project Cost	-	Revenue	=	Net Surplus Or Deficiency
--------------	--------------	---	---------	---	---------------------------

Where: Project Cost is the result of Formula 2.1,

And: Revenue is the money available for public facilities from current/proposed sources.

The answer to Question 2 validates the financial feasibility of the standards for levels of service that are used for each public facility in the CFP and in the other portions of the Growth Policy. The financially feasible standards for levels of service and the resulting capital improvement projects are used as the basis for policies and implementation programs in the final CFP.

Because the need for capital facilities is largely determined by the LOS that are adopted, the key to influencing the CFP is to influence the selection of the level of service standards. Level of service standards are measures of the quality of life of the community. The standards should be based on the community's vision of its future and its values.

The final standards for levels of service are adopted in the Growth Policy. The adopted standards (1) determine the need for capital improvements projects and (2) are the benchmark for testing the adequacy of public facilities for each proposed development.

The adopted standards can be amended, if necessary, once each year as part of the annual update of the CFP.

Growth Assumption

This CFP is based on the following population data:

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY POPULATION

1995	52,785*
2000	55,716*
2004	58,872**
2010	63,316**
2020	70,430**

NOTE: * = 1995/2000 data from U.S. Census Bureau.

** = Population forecasts.

A detailed analysis of the population forecast is presented in the Demographics and Economics chapter of the Growth Policy. Where appropriate, population data in this CFP is for sub-areas of the County, such as cities or special districts.

Capital Costs of Facilities

Appendix A lists the cost of capital improvements for 2000-2004 for County-owned and managed facilities and facilities provided by other public agencies that serve residents of Lewis and Clark County.

Financing for Capital Facilities

Table 1 is a summary of the financing plans for the capital improvements. The financing plan includes some existing sources of revenue and some new revenues:

(Note: Only those facilities that have capital costs are included below.)

TABLE 1:	LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY
-----------------	---

Revenue Source	2000-2004 (x \$1,000)	Capital Facility
Existing Revenue:		
		<u>Category A Public Facilities:</u>
Property Tax & PILT ³	1,743.0	Bridges ¹
Operating Reserves; Special	2,170.0	Solid Waste ¹
Montana Department of	1,302.0	Secondary Roads (State
4	500.0	Stormwater ¹
4	10,100.0	Water: City of Helena
		<u>Category B Public Facilities:</u>
Air Passenger Facility	327.4	Airport
Revenue Bonds	2,000.0	Care Facilities ¹
Property Tax: Two-year	<u>620.3</u>	Library ²
Sub-total: Existing Revenue	18,762.7	
New Revenue:		
		<u>Category A Public Facilities:</u>
Property Tax (levy increase)	1,696.8	Parks ²
G.O. Bond Issue	6,598.0	Roads ¹
TSEP Grant	500.0	Bridges ¹
TSEP Grant	900.0	Sewer: Augusta Sewer and
SRF Loan	684.0	Sewer: Augusta Sewer and
Federal Department of	1,505.8	Sewer: Fort Harrison
		<u>Category B Public Facilities:</u>
Federal Aviation	<u>2,945.0</u>	Airport

Sub-total: New Revenue	14,829.6	
Total	33,592.3	
¹ County Facilities ² City/County Facilities ³ Costs Not Allocated Between Revenues ⁴ Revenue Source Not Identified		

Level of Service Consequences of the CFP

Increased Levels of Service

The CFP will enable Lewis and Clark County to accommodate 6.25 percent growth during the next five years, resulting in a Countywide population increase from 55,409 (1999) to 58,872 people in 2004, while increasing the 1999 level of service for some public facilities (see Table 2). These population forecasts are consistent with the population analysis in the Demographics and Economics chapter of the Growth Policy. County-owned public facilities are indicated by the superscript notation (¹). (Note: Parks are a City/County facility.)

TABLE 2: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES WITH INCREASING LOS			
Facility	LOS Units	Current LOS	CFP LOS
<u>Category A Public Facilities:</u>			
Parks ¹			
Parkland *	Acres/1,000	4.642	5.218
Bicycle Trails	Miles/1,000	0.00	0.17
Sewer:			
Fort Harrison	Gallons/Capita/Day	23.75	100
City of Helena	Gallons/Capita/Day	146.95	150
Mountain View	Gallons/Capita/Day	44.9	50-70

Water:			
<u>Category B Public Facilities:</u>			
Fire:			
Birdseye Fire District	Response Time	3-10	5
Canyon Creek Fire District		15	12
Eastgate Fire District		7	3-4
East Valley Fire District		7	5
West Helena Valley Fire		8.5	7-8
Wolf Creek/Craig Fire Service		10-12	6
* County may sell some specific park parcels. No formal action has been taken at this time.			

No Change in Levels of Service

The level of service for the following facilities will be maintained as a result of the CFP (see Table 3). County-owned public facilities are indicated by the superscript notation ⁽¹⁾.

TABLE 3: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES WITH NO CHANGE IN LOS			
Facility	LOS Units	Current LOS	CFP LOS
<u>Category A Public Facilities:</u>			
Sewer:			
East Helena	Gallons/Capita/Day	122	122
Ten Mile/Pleasant Valley	Gallons/Capita/Day	100	100

Treasure State Acres	Gallons/Capita/Day	100	100
Water:			
East Helena	Gallons/Capita/Day	376	376

Reduced Levels of Service

The level of service for the following facilities will be reduced as a result of the CFP (see Table 4). County-owned public facilities are indicated by the superscript notation (¹). (Note: Library is a City/County facility)

TABLE 4: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES WITH REDUCED LOS			
Facility	LOS Units	Current LOS	CFP LOS
<u>Public Category A Facilities:</u>			
Sewer:			
Eastgate Sewer & Water	Gallons/Capita/Day	103	100
Leisure Village Mobile	Gallons/Capita/Day	100.26	100.00
<u>Category B Public Facilities:</u>			
Library ¹	Building Sq Ft/1,000	666.77	627.54

No Standards for Levels of Service

Level of service standards have not been developed for the facilities listed in Appendix B.

Explanation of Public Facilities

All types of facilities are included in the CFP, including public facilities owned and managed by Lewis and Clark County and other providers (i.e., cities, special districts, etc.). The CFP contains the following public facilities (in alphabetical order):

Airport	Parks
Care Facilities	Public Schools
Corrections	Road and Bridge
Fairgrounds	Sewer
Fire	Solid Waste
General Government	Stormwater
Law Enforcement	Water
Library	

The public facilities addressed in the Capital Improvements section of the CFP are grouped in the following two categories:

Category A: Those types of public facilities for which detailed information is available. Category A facilities are Parks, Roads and Bridges, Sewer, Solid Waste, Stormwater and Water.

Public facilities are presented in significant detail, including an inventory of existing facilities, their size or capacity, their level of service, a list of proposed capital improvement projects and their costs, and a financing plan to pay for the cost of the proposed projects.

Category B: All other public facilities: Airport, Care Facilities, Corrections, Fairgrounds, Fire, General Government, Law Enforcement, Library, and Public Schools.

Public facilities are presented in a more generalized fashion (although details are included where data is available).

Capital Improvements

Parks: Category A (County-wide)

Provider of Facilities

Lewis and Clark County and the incorporated cities of Helena and East Helena provide public parks and recreational facilities to the residents within the County.

The primary provider of community parks and neighborhood parks in Lewis and Clark County is the City of Helena, while the State and Federal governments are the primary providers of regional and waterfront parks. The County's role in the provision of park services has been to acquire land for park or open space purposes. Developers or homeowners groups are responsible for development and management of park sites. The County doesn't maintain County parkland on an individual basis.

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County park system consists of 257.2 acres of community, neighborhood and mini parks, open space and trails (excluding the Fairgrounds). The County may sell some specific park parcels in the future. No formal action has occurred at this time. Table 5 and 6 list each park and open space/greenway currently owned by Lewis and Clark County.

TABLE 5: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY: INVENTORY OF COUNTY-OWNED PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND TRAILS		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Mini-Parks:	Acres	
Bahny-Brae Park	1.15	West of Lake Helena Drive; off
Hahn Tract Tree Belt	0.62	
Hahn Tract West Park	0.32	
River Place Park	0.18	

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP****Draft: 3/1/02**

Thomas Court Park	<u>1.13</u>	North of John Plink Road; off
Total Mini-Parks	3.50	
Neighborhood Parks:	Acres	
Eastgate I Park	14.6	
Eastgate II Park	10.0	
Eastgate Village Park	6.27	East of Lake Helena Drive @ south end of Eastgate Village
Homestead Valley Park	2.51	East of Valley Drive; between Fichhoff Road & Bahnv Road
La Casa Grande Center Park	6.51	East of Valley Drive; off Cobre
Treasure State Park	<u>8.07</u>	East of Montana Ave. in Treasure State Subdivision
Total Neighborhood Parks	47.96	
Community Parks:	Acres	
Hooper Park	18.50	East end of Lincoln off US
Sierra Park *	23.29	Off Sierra Drive; South of
Total Community Parks	41.79	

TABLE 6: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY INVENTORY OF COUNTY-OWNED PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND TRAILS

Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Special Use Areas:	Acres	
Lincoln Citizens Park	1.90	
Ryan Exchange	72.06	Directly South of Fairgrounds
Unionville School	<u>3.50</u>	
Total Special Use Areas	77.46	

Undeveloped Park Land/Trails:	Acres	
Blackfoot Property	2.90	
Emily Acres II Property	1.85	
Gates of the Mountain Property	21.91	
Gilman Town Park	2.40	
Harris Property	1.87	
La Casa Grande North Property	2.86	
Lambkin Park	6.61	
Lemire Acres Property	8.70	
Lincoln Springs Property	19.69	
Lincoln Villa Property	3.12	
Oro Fino Property	3.05	
Ranch View I Property	5.81	
TOK Property	3.44	
Wooten Property	<u>2.28</u>	
Total Trails	86.49	
Total Parks, Open Space and Trails	257.2	

The City of Helena and East Helena also own and operate park and recreational facilities (see Appendix C). The City of Helena's park system consists of 1,100 acres parks, open space, trails and special use facilities, while East Helena's park system consists of over 10.4 acres of neighborhood and community parks.

In addition, the United States Forest Service maintains an inventory of 794.25 miles of hiking, horseback and snowmobile trails in Lewis and Clark County. There are also 243.5 miles of snowmobile trails within the Lewis and Clark National Forest.

Level of Service (LOS)

Levels of service are usually quantifiable measures of the amount of public facilities that are provided to the community. Levels of service may also measure the quality of some public facilities. Measures of levels of service may be expressed, for example, as park acres per 1,000 population or miles of trails per 1,000 population. Each level of service measure needs a specific piece of information--the specific quantity that measures the current or proposed level of service.

In order to make use of the level of service method, the County selects the way in which it will measure each facility (i.e., acres of park, miles of trail, etc.) and identifies the amount of the current and proposed (i.e., standard) level of service for each measurement. The LOS will enable the County to quantify the need for additional facilities as the County population continues to increase over time.

The Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (Volume III, January, 1998) recommends the following role of Lewis and Clark County:

1. Acquire and develop four large multi-use parks in the Helena Valley with funds from the subdivision process and other sources.
2. Assist the outlying communities in forming a park district to pay for park development and maintenance.
3. Discontinue the practice of acquiring small neighborhood parks unless the local neighborhood is willing to pay for their acquisition, development and maintenance.
4. Act as a grant agency to distribute money to various homeowner groups for park development.
5. Help establish a special service district for local homeowner groups to pay for park development and maintenance.
6. Set up maintenance contracts and central purchasing procedures for homeowner groups.
7. Cover the liability insurance requirements for parks currently maintained by homeowners groups.
8. Act as a design consultant to homeowners groups for park development.
9. Offer recreation programs in the Helena Valley through contracts with the City of Helena.

Park Land LOS

Acreage that is currently owned by Lewis and Clark County, regardless of its state of development, is counted as "capacity" for the purpose of calculating LOS for County-owned parks. The **current LOS** provided by the County's park system is based

on the current inventory of County-owned park acres divided by the 1999 County population. This equates to 4.642 acres per 1,000 population for all types of County-owned parks shown in Table 8.

The County **Proposed LOS** is 5.281 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. The proposed LOS is based on Option A as presented in the *Cost Impact of a Park District* (October 1, 1997 memorandum from JC Draggoo & Associates, Inc., to the Lewis and Clark Parks Board). Option A provides an analysis that adds 50 acres of parkland and higher quality park development to implement the Parks Plan for the Helena Valley. The proposed LOS assumes the planned parkland and development capital projects will serve the projected countywide population through the 2000-2004 planning period.

Table 7 calculates the requirements for County-owned parkland for each of the levels of service (current and proposed). The current LOS would require 16.1 additional acres of County-owned parks. The proposed LOS would require 50 additional acres. The County's capital improvement projects are listed at the bottom of Table 7, and their acreage is applied to the "deficiency" from the proposed LOS to show the cumulative deficiency of County-owned park acres compared to the requirement. The 4 projects total 50 acres, thus fulfilling the requirement for the proposed LOS.

TABLE 7: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Park Land Current LOS = 4.642 Acres Per 1,000 Population				
(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Acres Required @ 0.00462 per Capita	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/ (Deficiency)
1999	55,409	257.2	257.2	0.0
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr	3,463	16.1		(16.1)
2004 Total	58,872	273.3	257.2	(16.1)
Park Land Proposed LOS = 5.218 Acres Per 1,000 Population				

(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Acres Required @	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/
1999	55,409	289.1	257.2	(31.9)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr	3,463	18.1		(18.1)
2004 Total	58,872	307.2	257.2	(50.0)
CAPACITY				
1. Sierra Park: development			0	(50.0)
2. North Valley Park: acquisition and development			20	(30.0)
3. Warren Park: acquisition and development			20	(10.0)
4. East Valley Park: acquisition and development			10	0.0

Bicycle Trail LOS

The County does not currently have an inventory of bicycle trails, therefore the **current LOS** is 0.0 miles per 1,000 population.

The County **proposed LOS** for bicycle trails is 0.17 miles per 1,000 population. The proposed LOS is based on Option A as presented in the *Cost Impact of a Park District* (October 1, 1997 memorandum from JC Draggoo & Associates, Inc., to the Lewis and Clark Parks Board). Option A recommends 10 miles of trail to implement the parks plan for the Helena Valley. The proposed LOS assumes the planned trail development capital projects will serve the projected county-wide population through the 2000-2004 planning period.

Table 8 calculates the requirements for County-owned bicycle trails for each of the levels of service (current and proposed). The current LOS would require no County-owned bicycle trails. The proposed LOS would require 10 miles of

County-owned bicycle trails. The County's capital improvement projects are listed in Appendix D, and their mileage is applied to the "deficiency" from the proposed LOS to show the cumulative deficiency of County-owned bicycle trail miles compared to the requirement. The proposed project provides 10 miles, thus fulfilling the requirement for the proposed LOS.

TABLE 8: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Bicycle Trails Current LOS = 0.0 Miles Per 1,000 Population				
(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Miles Required @ 0.00000 per Capita	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/ (Deficiency)
1999	55,409	0.0	0.0	0.0
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	3,463	0.0		0.0
2004 Total	58,872	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bicycle Trails Proposed LOS = 0.17 Miles Per 1,000 Population				
(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Miles Required @ 0.00017 per Capita	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/ (Deficiency)
1999	55,409	9.4	0.0	(9.4)

2000 - 2004: 5 Yr	<u>3,463</u>	0.6		(0.6)
2004 Total	58,872	10.0	0.0	(10.0)
CAPACITY				
1. Bicycle Trails:			10.0	0.0

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Capital projects are presented in 2 categories: capacity and non-capacity. The projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., acres of parkland, miles of trails), are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements which do not provide new capacity).

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

Lewis and Clark County park and recreation facilities include five (5) capital projects at a cost of \$1,696,800. The capital projects are based on the proposed LOS for parkland and bicycle trails.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is included in Appendix D.

ROADS AND BRIDGE: CATEGORY A

Provider of Facilities

Lewis and Clark County is the primary provider of roads and bridges for the residents of the unincorporated County.

Current Facilities**Roads**

The County's road system consists of 1,256 miles of paved and unpaved roads under the jurisdiction of the County. Beginning in January, 2001, secondary roads became the responsibility of the State. Appendix E lists each County road facility along with its location, condition, and length, along with each secondary road facility to be managed by the State, along with its location and length.

Bridges

There are 122 bridges in Lewis and Clark County; of these, 76 are new or in good condition; and 46 are in fair to critical condition. Appendix E lists the County bridges by planning area, including the location and waterway crossing.

Level of Service (LOS)**Roads LOS**

Lewis and Clark County does not have traditional capacity based standards for level of service. The County does evaluate the condition of its roads. The evaluation is based on a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) using various criteria such as cracking, raveling, rutting, rideability, and drainage. Each roadway is evaluated using the following rating criteria:

Excellent:	No work required
Fair:	Maintenance required (chip seal)
Poor:	Resurface road with overlay
Fail:	Reconstruct roadway

The County Road Department regularly maintains and/or plows 216 miles of paved roads and 434 miles of unpaved road for a total of 650 miles. Those roadways, which receive regular maintenance, consist of roads that are graded at least once per year and are on the County's snow route to maintain winter access.

The County's standard for its existing roadway system is a 20-year design life. This standard takes into account such factors as performance, serviceability, reliability, and safety.

Bridge LOS

The level of service for a bridge is indicated by its structural condition rating: good, fair, poor, or critical.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Roads

County Facilities: The County road facilities include 35 capital projects totaling \$6,598,000 during the 2000–2004 planning period. The proposed financing plan is shown in Appendix F. The projects are listed in priority order by roadway type (i.e., paved and unpaved) and include those projects most in need of rehabilitation in order to meet the County's 20-year design life criteria.

State Facilities: The secondary road facilities include 14 capital projects totaling \$1,302,000 during the 2000-2004 planning period. The proposed financing plan is shown in Appendix F. The projects, that will be taken over by the State in January, 2001, are listed in priority order based on the County's evaluation of roadways most in need of rehabilitation in order to meet the County's 20-year design life criteria.

Bridges

The County bridge facilities include 11 capital projects at a cost of \$2,243,000. The capital projects consist of the replacement or repair of bridges with a structural condition rating of "critical," "poor," or "fair." Some bridges rated as "poor" will be closed rather than replaced or repaired. The proposed financing plan is shown in Appendix F.

**SEWER: CATEGORY A:
Augusta Sewer and Water District (Augusta Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Augusta Sewer and Water District was formed in 1997 to served the Augusta townsite.

Current Facilities

The district has a central sewer system that uses gravity to transport wastewater to the town's treatment facility. Table 9 lists the district's inventory of facilities.

TABLE 9: AUGUSTA SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Lagoon	5 Acres	County Road @ Abandoned Railroad

Level of Service (LOS)

Information regarding LOS for the Augusta Sewer and Water District is not available.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

An engineering evaluation of the wastewater treatment system was conducted in 1997 to address concerns identified during a Montana Department of Environmental Quality inspection of the facilities in 1996. The concerns include leakage from the lagoon and potential un-permitted discharges to Elk Creek. The May, 1997 *Preliminary Engineering Evaluation* identifies alternative capital projects which address the concerns. The preferred alternative project is shown in Appendix G.

**Sewer:
Eastgate Sewer and Water District
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Eastgate Water and Sewer Association owns, manages and operates a central wastewater system that serves 450 homes (with an existing population of approximately 1,100 to 1,300 people depending on the actual occupancy per household) in the Eastgate Subdivision (both Eastgate I and Eastgate II).

Current Facilities

Wastewater generated by the Subdivision is collected by a gravity collection system. Wastewater treatment consists of a lagoon system with effluent disposal by irrigation on cropland immediately north of the subdivision. Table 10 lists the District's sewer facilities.

TABLE 10: EASTGATE SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity (mg)	Location
Aerated Lagoon System: Treatment		
Primary Pond	0.13	
Aerated Lagoon System: Storage		
Primary Pond	3.7	
Secondary Pond	18.0	
Total Storage Capacity	21.7	
Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Location
Irrigation Land	120	Immediately North of the Subdivision

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 103 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The **proposed LOS** is 100 gpcd. The proposed standard is the same as the State design standard (source: *Appendix F Helena Area Wastewater Treatment (HAWT) Facility Plan*, Draft, August, 1997).

Tables 11 and 12 show the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period, for two growth scenarios: low growth (Table 11) and high growth (Table 12). The statistical table at the top of Tables 11 and 12 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

The low growth scenario assumes 2.5 persons per dwelling unit resulting in a current (1995) population of 1,100, and a buildout population (year 2020) of 1,450. The high growth scenario assumes 3.0 persons per dwelling unit, resulting in a current population of 1,450 and a buildout population (year 2020) of 1,750.

TABLE 11: EASTGATE SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment: Low Growth Current LOS = 103 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	District	103.0	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Inventory	(Deficiency)
1999	1,126	0.116	0.130	0.014

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP*****Draft: 3/1/02***

2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	70	0.007		(0.007)
2004 Total	1,196	0.123	0.130	0.007
Wastewater Treatment: Low Growth Proposed LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	District	100.0	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Inventory	(Deficiency)
1999	1,126	0.113	0.130	0.017
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr. Growth	70	0.007		(0.007)
2004 Total	1,196	0.120	0.130	0.010
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				

TABLE 12: EASTGATE SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT SEWER ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment: High Growth Current LOS = 103 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	District	103.0	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Inventory	(Deficiency)
1999	1,474	0.152	0.130	(0.022)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	60	0.006		(0.006)
2004 Total	1,534	0.158	0.130	(0.028)
Wastewater Treatment: High Growth Proposed LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	District	100.0	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Inventory	(Deficiency)

1999	1,474	0.147	0.130	(0.017)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	60	0.006		(0.006)
2004 Total	1,534	0.153	0.130	(0.023)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects have been identified.

**Sewer:
East Helena (Helena Valley Planning Area)****Provider of Facilities**

The City of East Helena owns and operates the wastewater collection and treatment facilities that serve the City.

Current Facilities

The wastewater system provides secondary treatment of wastewater and disposal by discharge into the Prickly Pear Creek. Table 13 lists the City's inventory of facilities.

TABLE 13: EAST HELENA: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Aerated Lagoon System (3 cells)	0.6	

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 122 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The **proposed LOS** is also 122 gpcd (source: *Draft Wastewater Facility Master Plan, East Helena, Montana, Phase 1: Treatment*, December, 1997). Tables 14 and 15 show the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period, for two scenarios analyzed in the draft Master Plan: No annexations (Table 14) and with annexations (Table 15). The statistical table at the top of Tables 14 and 15 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 14: EAST HELENA SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment: No Annexations Current LOS = 122 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		122.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	1,709	0.208	0.600	0.392
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	45	0.005		(0.005)
2004 Total	1,754	0.213	0.600	0.387

Wastewater Treatment: No Annexations Proposed LOS = 122 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		122.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	1,709	0.208	0.600	0.392
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr. Growth	45	0.005		(0.005)
2004 Total	1,754	0.213	0.600	0.387
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				
TABLE 15: EAST HELENA SEWER ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment: With Annexations Current LOS = 122 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP****Draft: 3/1/02**

	District	122.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	2,707	0.330	0.600	0.270
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	184	0.022		(0.022)
2004 Total	2,891	0.352	0.600	0.248
Wastewater Treatment: With Annexations Proposed LOS = 122 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	District	122.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	2,707	0.330	0.600	0.270
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	184	0.022		(0.022)
2004 Total	2,891	0.352	0.600	0.248
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The draft Master Plan identifies \$573,726 in capital projects to be completed by December 31, 1998. However, no capital projects have been identified for the 2000-2004 planning period.

**Sewer:
Fort Harrison (Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Veterans' Administration owns and operates a wastewater collection and treatment system which serves Fort Harrison, a federally owned facility serving the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Montana National Guard, United States Naval Reserve, United States Army Reserve, and various training units. On December 21, 1998 the City of Helena Commission approved Fort Harrison's connection to the City's wastewater system.

Current Facilities

Table 16 lists Fort Harrison's inventory of facilities.

TABLE 16: FORT HARRISON INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES				
Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Capacity (mg)	Detention Time (days)	Location
Lagoon System:				At Fort Harrison
Primary Pond	5	8.3	125	
Secondary Pond	5	8.3	0*	
Total	10	16.6	125	
* Cell is unlined; if lined the detention time would also be 125 days.				

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 23.75 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The current standard is based on the year 2000 population and average gallons per day, as reported in Table 1 of the January 1999 report *Fort Harrison Wastewater Connection to the City of Helena*. Population numbers take into account the hospital patients, employees and trainees. The **proposed LOS** is 100 gpcd. The proposed LOS is the guideline used in *The Helena Area Wastewater Facility Plan* analysis of Fort Harrison and the Westside area.

Table 17 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. No available capacity is shown because Fort Harrison will be connecting to the City of Helena's system. Fort Harrison's requirements, as shown in Table 17, should be considered an additional requirement for the City of Helena. The statistical table at the top of Table 17 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 17: FORT HARRISON SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 23.75 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		23.75	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP*****Draft: 3/1/02***

2000	1,395	0.033		(0.033)
2001 - 2004 Growth	201	0.005		(0.005)
2004 Total	1,596	0.038		(0.038)
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		100	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
2000	1,395	0.140		(0.140)
2001 - 2004 Growth	201	0.020		(0.020)
2004 Total	1,596	0.160		(0.160)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
1. Connect to City of Helena WTP: Lift Station and Piping			0.160	0.000

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Fort Harrison sewer capital improvements consist of one project totaling \$1,505,800 for connection to the City of Helena Wastewater Treatment Plan. This project was approved by the City of Helena Commission in conjunction with approval to connect to the City's system.

Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., wastewater treatment gallons per capita per day) are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements which do not provide new capacity).

The proposed financing plan is shown in Appendix G. Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

Sewer: Helena (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The City of Helena owns and operates the wastewater collection and treatment facilities that serve the City.

Current Facilities

The City of Helena's wastewater system consists of a central gravity collection system and a secondary treatment plant. Table 18 lists the City of Helena's inventory of facilities.

TABLE 18: CITY OF HELENA: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity (mgd)	Location
Wastewater Treatment Facility	6.0 * * Rating	
Name of Facility	Capacity (gpm)	Location
Major Interceptors and Collectors:		
East Zone:		
Washington Street Interceptor:	11,600	Cedar/Washington
	2,970	Broadway/I-15
	3,770	Broadway/I-15
	1,572	Saddle Drive/Belt View
Central Zone:		
Lamborn Interceptor:	815	Oakes/Boulder
	1,140	Lamborn/Boulder
	640	Lamborn/Butte
	985	Lamborn/Missoula
Montana Interceptor	5,600	Lyndale/Montana
	4,770	Montana/11th
Roberts Interceptor	7,500	Railroad/Harris
	4,170	Sanders/Livingston

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP*****Draft: 3/1/02***

Basin Interceptor	7,200	Roberts/Helena
	1,500	Davis/14th
Front Street Interceptor	3,800	Harris/Cole
	4,060	Cole/National
Harris Street Collector	3,200	Harris/Cole
I-15 Collector	12,100	Oakes/Cole
	12,500	I-15/Custer 3S
West Zone:		
Custer Interceptor	12,700	Custer/Washington IE
	4,225	Custer/Sanders
	1,750	Custer/Benton
	2,100	Brady
	2,100	Brady/Oval-J St
	1,435	Joslyn/Waukesha
Sub-Basin W-1	730	Linden/Hudson Alley
Sub-Basin W-2	485	Linden/Hudson Alley
	860	Linden/Leslie
	485	Laurel/Wilder
TABLE 18: CITY OF HELENA: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity (feet)	Location

Sewer Pipe:		
3 Inch Pipe	326	System-wide
6 Inch Pipe	12,632	System-wide
8 Inch Pipe	371,994	System-wide
9 Inch Pipe	44,293	System-wide
10 Inch Pipe	43,426	System-wide
12 Inch Pipe	22,024	System-wide
15 Inch Pipe	12,402	System-wide
18 Inch Pipe	14,073	System-wide
19 Inch Pipe	1,466	System-wide
21 Inch Pipe	12,540	System-wide
24 Inch Pipe	29,435	System-wide
30 Inch Pipe	2,831	System-wide
24x36 Inch Pipe (egg-shaped)	523	System-wide
10x8 Inch Pipe	168	System-wide
Unknown Pipe Size	7,005	System-wide
Total Sewer Pipe	575,138	

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 146.95 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The current standard is based on 1995 population figures and 1995 annual average MGD (million gallons per day), as reported in Table 3-3 of the July, 1997 Final *Helena, Montana Wastewater Facility Plan*. The **proposed LOS** is 150 gpcd. The **proposed LOS** is used to project

future wastewater flows for the year 2010 in the final *Helena Wastewater Facility Plan* analysis of the City of Helena's system.

Table 19 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. The statistical table at the top of Table 19 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 19: CITY OF HELENA SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 146.95 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		146.95	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	26,340	3.871	6.000	2.129
2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>611</u>	<u>0.090</u>		<u>(0.090)</u>
2004 Total	26,951	3.961		2.039
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 150.00 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		150.00	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	26,340	3.951	6.000	2.049
2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>611</u>	<u>0.092</u>		<u>(0.092)</u>
2004 Total	26,951	4.043		1.957
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The Helena Final *Wastewater Facility Plan* (July, 1997) identifies a total of \$9,950,000 in capital projects scheduled in 1999 to upgrade the wastewater system to satisfy current and future discharge permit requirements. However, no capital projects are identified for the 2000-2004 planning period.

Sewer: Leisure Village (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Leisure Village Mobile Home Park owns and operates a central collection and treatment system that serves the residents of the park.

Current Facilities

The Leisure Village wastewater treatment system consists of a series of storage ponds with effluent disposal by irrigation. Table 20 lists the Leisure Village inventory of facilities.

TABLE 20: LEISURE VILLAGE: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES				
Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Capacity (mgd)	Detention Time	Location
Lagoon System: Pond 1 Pond 2	5.12 3.70 5.03			1 Mile North of the Village between Wylie Rd & Helberg Dr.
Total	17.08	0.100	30	

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 100.26 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The current standard is based on the year 1995 population and wastewater flow per day (gpd) as reported in Appendix I of the August, 1997 *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan*. The **proposed LOS** is 100 gpcd. The proposed LOS is used to project future wastewater flows for the year 2020 in the *Facility Plan* analysis of the Leisure Village system.

Table 21 shows the current and proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. The statistical table at the top of Table 21 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 21: LEISURE VILLAGE SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 100.26 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		100.26	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	2,485	0.249	0.100	(0.149)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>250</u>	<u>0.025</u>		<u>(0.025)</u>
2004 Total	2,735	0.274	0.100	(0.174)
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 100.0 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		100.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)

1999	2,485	0.249	0.100	(0.149)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>250</u>	<u>0.025</u>		<u>(0.025)</u>
2004 Total	2,735	0.274	0.100	(0.174)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment (HAWT) Facility Plan Appendix I* includes various treatment alternatives for the Leisure Village wastewater system. The study states that a more detailed feasibility analysis and cost estimate is needed before finalizing the preferred treatment alternative.

Sewer: Mountain View Academy (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Mountain View Law Enforcement Academy, a state owned complex, manages its own wastewater collection and treatment facilities.

Current Facilities

The Mountain View Academy wastewater system consists of a gravity collection system that delivers the wastewater to a lift station located at the north end of the facility. Treatment consists of a lagoon system with effluent disposal by evaporation and seepage. Table 22 lists the Mountain View Academy inventory of facilities.

TABLE 22: MOUNTAIN VIEW ACADEMY: INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES

Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Capacity (mgd)	Detention Time (days)	Location
Lagoon System				Sierra Road & Floweree Drive
Primary Pond	0.75			
Secondary Pond	<u>0.75</u>			
Total	1.50	0.007	314	

Level of Service (LOS)

The **current LOS** is 44.9 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The current standard is based on the year 1995 population of 127 for Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) 276 (in which Mountain View is located) and wastewater flow per day of 5,600 gpd, as reported in Appendix H of the August, 1997 *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan*. The **proposed LOS** is a range of 50 to 70 gpcd. The proposed LOS is used to project future wastewater flows for the year 2020 in the *Facility Plan* analysis of the Mountain View wastewater system.

Table 23 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period (the proposed LOS analysis is based on the higher range of 70 gpcd). The statistical table at the top of Table 23 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 23: MOUNTAIN VIEW ACADEMY SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 44.9 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		44.90	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	143	0.006	0.007	0.001
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>21</u>	<u>0.001</u>		<u>(0.001)</u>
2004 Total	164	0.007	0.007	0.000
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 70.0 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		70.0	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	143	0.010	0.007	(0.003)

2000 - 2004: 5 Yr. Growth	<u>21</u>	<u>0.001</u>		<u>(0.001)</u>
2004 Total	164	0.011	0.007	(0.004)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

There are no recommended capital projects in Appendix H of the *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment (HAWT) Facility Plan* analysis of the Mountain View wastewater system.

Sewer: Ten Mile/Pleasant Valley (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The collection systems for the two subdivisions are owned and operated by the Ten Mile/Pleasant Valley Homeowners Association. The treatment facility is owned by a private person. The Association maintains a long-term contract for wastewater treatment and disposal.

Current Facilities

Each subdivision has its own gravity collection system that delivers wastewater to a privately owned treatment facility. The treatment facility consists of a lagoon system with effluent disposal by evaporation. Table 24 lists the Ten Mile/Pleasant Valley inventory of facilities.

TABLE 24: TEN MILE/PLEASANT VALLEY INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES				
Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Capacity (mgd)	Detention Time	Location
Lagoon System				South side of Kelly Road, 1/2 mile east of Pleasant Valley
Pond 1	2.5		20-35	
Pond 2	2.5		0	
Pond 3	10.0		0	
Total	15.0	0.09	20-35	

Level of Service (LOS)

No wastewater flow data is available for the wastewater system. The analysis of the system in Appendix J of the August, 1997 *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan* assumes a **current LOS** of 100.0 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The **proposed LOS** is also 100 gpcd. The proposed LOS is used to project future wastewater flows for the year 2020 in the *Facility Plan* analysis of the Leisure Village system.

Table 25 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period.. The statistical table at the top of Table 25 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 25: TEN MILE/PLEASANT VALLEY SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		100	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	932	0.093	0.090	(0.003)
2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>43</u>	<u>0.004</u>		<u>(0.004)</u>
2004 Total	975	0.097		(0.007)
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
		100	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	932	0.093	0.090	(0.003)
2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>43</u>	<u>0.004</u>		<u>(0.004)</u>

2004 Total	975	0.097		(0.007)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment (HAWT) Facility Plan Appendix J* includes various treatment alternatives for the Ten Mile/Pleasant Valley wastewater system. The study states that a more detailed feasibility analysis and cost estimate is needed before finalizing the preferred treatment alternative.

Sewer: Treasure State Acres Sewer District (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Treasure State Acres County Sewer District owns and operates the wastewater collection and treatment facility that provides service to the Treasure State Acres Subdivision.

Current Facilities

Wastewater treatment is provided by a central gravity collection system and a two-cell storage lagoon. Disposal of wastewater is by spray irrigation on an adjoining field. Table 26 lists the Treasure State Acres Sewer District inventory of facilities.

TABLE 26: TREASURE STATE ACRES SEWER DISTRICT INVENTORY OF SEWER FACILITIES				
Name of Facility	Size (acres)	Capacity (mgd)	Detention Time (days)	Location
Lagoon Treatment System				3/4 Mile east of Treasure State Acres across I-15
West Cell	4.43			
East Cell	6.23			
Total	10.66	0.10		
Disposal System				
Irrigated Land	15			Adjacent to Lagoon

Level of Service (LOS)

The analysis of the Treasure State Acres wastewater system in Appendix K of the August, 1997 *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan* assumes a **current LOS** of 100.0 gpcd (gallons per capita per day). The **proposed LOS** is also 100 gpcd. The proposed LOS is used to project future wastewater flows for the year 2020 in the *Facility Plan* analysis of the Treasure State Acres wastewater system.

Table 27 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. The statistical table at the top of Table 27 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

The basis for the population forecasts for the planning period is the analysis in Appendix K of the Facility Plan. The analysis assumes the Treasure State Acres subdivision is built-out but development will occur in the west and northwest portions of the Treasure State Acres study area.

TABLE 27: TREASURE STATE ACRES SEWER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Wastewater Treatment Current LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
	District	Required @		Net
	Study Area	100	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	1,641	0.164		(0.164)
2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>149</u>	<u>0.015</u>		<u>(0.015)</u>
2004 Total	1,790	0.179		(0.179)
Wastewater Treatment Proposed LOS = 100 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
	District	Required @		Net
	Study Area	100	MGD	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Available	(Deficiency)
1999	1,641	0.164		(0.164)

2000- 2004 5-Yr Growth	<u>149</u>	<u>0.015</u>		<u>(0.015)</u>
2004 Total	1,790	0.179		(0.179)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment (HAWT) Facility Plan Appendix K* recommends one capital project totaling \$643,000 to increase storage volume at the existing facility. This project was to be completed in September, 1998. Total capacity (MGD) with the expansion is not identified in the analysis (capacity prior to the expansion was 0.1 MGD). No other capital projects are included in the Facility Plan analysis of the Treasure State Acres Sewer District.

SOLID WASTE: CATEGORY A

Provider of Facilities

The Scratchgravel Landfill District provides landfill facilities for the disposal of solid waste. The landfill is operated by the Lewis and Clark County Public Works Department. It is overseen by the Scratchgravel Solid Waste Board and is governed by the Board of County Commissioners.

Collection service is not provided by the County. Landowners either haul their own waste to a transfer station, or contract with a local collection firm for service.

Current Facilities

The District operates a Class 2 landfill located in the northeast Helena Valley. All local waste received at the landfill is routed through the City of Helena transfer station in order to control the deposit of hazardous or other wastes that do not conform to the Class 2 license and to reduce traffic at the landfill. Table 28 lists the County inventory of facilities.

TABLE 28: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY: INVENTORY OF COUNTY-OWNED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
LANDFILLS	Tons (million)	
Scratchgravel Landfill	2.76	1 mile from Lake Helena Drive & Deal Lane intersection

Level of Service (LOS)

The County landfill has a total capacity of 2,726,000 tons, of which 175,000 tons have been utilized (as of June 30, 1998). This leaves a balance of available capacity of 2,551,000 tons. Based on County estimates 50,000 tons of landfill waste will be generated annually. At this rate the existing landfill as a remaining life of 51 years (as of June, 1998).

Table 29 shows the current remaining capacity along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. The statistical table at the top of Table 29 calculates the amount of facility capacity that will be utilized for each year in the planning period along with the remaining capacity. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 29: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY SOLID WASTE ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		Annual	
	Beginning	Capacity	Net Capacity
	Capacity	Required	Available

Time Period	(million tons)	(million tons)	(million tons)
1998			2.551
1999	2.551	0.050	2.501
2000	2.501	0.050	2.451
2001	2.451	0.050	2.401
2002	2.401	0.050	2.351
2003	2.351	0.050	2.301
2004	2.301	0.050	2.251
CAPACITY PROJECTS			
No Capital Projects			

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Lewis and Clark County solid waste facilities include two (2) capital projects at a cost of \$2,170,000. Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., additional landfill capacity, in tons) are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements that do not provide new capacity).

The capital projects were provided by staff. Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is shown in Appendix H.

Stormwater: Category A

Provider of Facilities

Lewis and Clark County

Current Facilities

The inventory of stormwater facilities will be available upon completion of a County stormwater master plan.

Level of Service (LOS)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standard is a 100 year, 72 hour storm event. The County's standard for stormwater retention and runoff will be developed as part of the stormwater master plan project.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Lewis and Clark County stormwater facilities include one (1) capital project at a cost of \$500,000. This project consists of the development of a stormwater master plan.

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described in Appendix I. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

WATER: CATEGORY A City of Helena (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The City of Helena owns and operates water treatment plants that provide drinking water to residents of the City.

Current Facilities

The City of Helena water supply system consists of the Tenmile Water Treatment Plant, the Missouri River Water Treatment Plan, and the Hale and Eureka water collection systems. Table 30 lists the City of Helena facility inventory.

**TABLE 30: CITY OF HELENA:
INVENTORY OF WATER FACILITIES**

Name of Facility	Capacity (mgd)	Location
Tenmile Water Treatment Plant	8.0	
Missouri River Water Treatment Plant	4.1 *	
Hale Collection System	0.3	
Eureka Collection System	<u>0.6</u>	
Total Capacity	13.0	

* An expansion in 1983 increased the design rate to 12 mgd, but a number of identified issues and concerns relating to plant reliability, risk to public health, and operator safety, has reduced the amount of treated water the existing plant can provide on a reliable basis.

Level of Service (LOS)

According to the *Missouri River Water Treatment Plant Evaluation (MRWTP) and Water Master Plan Update*, December, 1997, the current (1995) maximum daily demand for the City of Helena water service area is 13 mgd. Assuming a City population of 25,860, this equates to a **current LOS** of 502.7 gpcd (gallons per capita per day) for maximum daily demand (the MRWTP evaluation and analysis is based on maximum daily demand rather than average daily demand). The MRWTP analysis estimate of future maximum day demand for the year 2020 is 18 mgd. Assuming a City population of 29,005, this equates to a **proposed LOS** of 620.5 gpcd for maximum daily use.

Population projections for the City of Helena were not included in the MRWTP analysis provided by the County for review. The City of Helena population forecasts used in the *Helena Area Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan* (August, 1998 final report) were used to determine the current and proposed LOS expressed as gallons per capita per day (gpcd) and the requirements analysis in Table 31.

TABLE 31: CITY OF HELENA WATER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Water Treatment Current LOS = 502.7 GPCD Maximum Day Demand				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @		Net
	City	502.7	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	Inventory	(Deficiency)
1999	26,340	13.2	13.0	(0.2)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>611</u>	<u>0.3</u>		<u>(0.3)</u>
2004 Total	26,951	13.5	13.0	(0.5)
Water Treatment Proposed LOS = 620.5 GPCD Maximum Day Demand				

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		

		Required @		Net
	City	620.5	Current	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	(gpcd)	Inventory	(Deficiency)
1999	26,340	16.3	13.0	(3.3)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>611</u>	<u>0.4</u>		<u>(0.4)</u>
2004 Total	26,951	16.7	13.0	(3.7)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
1. New Groundwater Wells (2 wells)			3.0	(0.7)
2. Replace MRWTP (4.1 MGD) with a New 5 MGD WTP			0.9	0.2

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The City of Helena water facilities include two (2) capital projects totaling \$10,100,000. These projects are recommended in the City of Helena *Missouri River Water Treatment Evaluation and Water Master Plan Update*, December 1997 Phase I and Phase II Reports to upgrade that facility.

Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., millions of gallons per day) are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements which do not provide new capacity).

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is shown in Appendix J.

Water:
East Helena (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

East Helena owns and operates the water treatment system that provides drinking water to residents of the City.

Current Facilities

East Helena water supply system consists of the two groundwater sources from which water is pumped through a chlorination building before reaching a storage tank. Table 32 lists the City of Helena facility inventory.

TABLE 32: EAST HELENA: INVENTORY OF WATER FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Location
WELLS	<u>gpm</u>	
McClellan Creek (2 radial wells)	600	Near McCellan Creek southeast of town
Valley Wells (3)	1350	North of Town
TRANSMISSION MAINS	<u>Feet</u>	
McClellan Creek: 10-inch steel pipe	12,800	
Valley Wells: 8-10 inch asbestos cement line	9,582	
STORAGE	<u>Gallons</u>	
McClellan Creek (2)	550,000	Southeast of East Helena near McClellan Creek Wells
Reservoir 3	312,000	Southwest of East Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

According to the April, 1995 *Water Supply System Study for East Helena*, the **current LOS** (i.e., 1992 average daily demand) for the East Helena water system was 376 gpcd. The **proposed LOS** is also 376 gpcd. This LOS was used in the system study to project future water requirements for East Helena.

Table 33 shows the current LOS and the proposed LOS, along with an analysis of capacity required during the 2000-2004 planning period. The statistical table at the top of Table 33 calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for level of service. The capital improvement projects that provide the needed capacity are listed below the requirements analysis, and their capacities are reconciled to the total requirement in the table.

TABLE 33: EAST HELENA WATER: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Water Treatment Current LOS = 376 GPCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @	Current	Net
	City	376	Inventory	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	(MGD)*	(Deficiency)
1999	1,709	0.6		(0.6)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>45</u>	<u>0.0</u>		<u>0.0</u>
2004 Total	1,754	0.6	0.0	(0.6)
Water Treatment				

Proposed LOS = 376 GPCD

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		MGD		
		Required @	Current	Net
	City	376	Inventory	Surplus or
Time Period	Population	gpcd	(MGD)*	(Deficiency)
1999	1,709	0.6		(0.6)
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr Growth	<u>45</u>	<u>0.0</u>		<u>0.0</u>
2004 Total	1,754	0.6	0.0	(0.6)
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				

The *East Helena Water Supply System Study* (April, 1995) identifies several capital projects to be completed in two phases: Phase I projects were to be implemented immediately and Phase II projects were to be implemented over a future 10-year planning period. No time line was included for scheduling and completion of the projects, therefore the status of projects is not known.

* The existing MGD capacity of the water system was not identified in the Water Supply System Study analysis.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The April, 1995 *East Helena Water Supply System Study* identifies \$2,150,500 in Phase I system improvements which are immediate priorities. It is not clear if these projects have been completed. The system study also identifies future phased improvements totaling \$1,359,188. Because a time line for these projects is also not identified, it is not known if any projects are scheduled during the 2000-2004 planning period.

AIRPORT: CATEGORY B

Provider of Facilities

The Helena Regional Airport Authority was formed in December 1993 by a Joint Resolution executed by Lewis and Clark County and the City of Helena each appoint three members to the Airport Board, and a seventh member is appointed by these six members.

Current Facilities

The airport provides commercial passenger service via one major airline and two regional airlines. In addition, buildings are leased to the FAA and the U.S. Department of Immigration. Recently the Airport Authority constructed new private aviation hangers, converted the terminal's lower floor to offices, adding approximately 60,000 square feet of leased office space. A National Guard helicopter battalion, regional fire training center, a fire dispatch facility, and private and community recreational facilities have also been constructed on the airport property. Table 34 lists the airport facilities.

TABLE 34: HELENA AREA REGIONAL AIRPORT: INVENTORY OF AIRPORT FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Helena Regional Airport		2850 Skyway Drive, Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

Helena Area Regional Airport facilities include four (4) capital projects at a cost of \$3,272,400. The capital projects are from the FY 1998-2003 Airport Capital Improvement Plan (revised 11/9/98). Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., airport operations such as annual/daily takeoffs and landings) are listed first, followed by

non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements which do not provide new capacity).

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is shown in Appendix K.

CARE FACILITIES: CATEGORY B

Provider of Facilities

Lewis and Clark County owns and operates the Cooney Convalescent Home. The Home serves the three-county area of Lewis and Clark, Broadwater and Jefferson Counties.

Current Facilities

The Cooney Convalescent Home provides 24-hour skilled and intermediate level nursing care to geriatric residents. It provides all activities of daily living including meals, personal hygiene, medication, and laundry.

Table 35 lists the County care facilities.

TABLE 35: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY INVENTORY OF CARE FACILITIES			
	Capacity or Size		
Name of Facility	Sq. Ft.	Beds	Location
Cooney Convalescent Home	32,311	76	2555 Broadway, Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The Cooney Convalescent Home facilities include one (1) capital project at a cost of \$2,000,000. Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., beds) are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation, replacement and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements that do not provide new capacity).

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan. The capital project was provided by County staff.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is shown in Appendix L.

CORRECTIONS: CATEGORY B

Provider of Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Detention Facility houses prisoners for the federal and state governments, City of Helena, City of East Helena, and Lewis and Clark County.

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Detention Center is responsible for the detention of persons as required by law. These persons are either awaiting trial or serving sentences as set by the court. The Detention Center staff consists of 18 detention officers, 1 nurse, an administrator, and an accounting clerk. Table 36 lists the County corrections facilities.

TABLE 36: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY: INVENTORY OF CORRECTIONS FACILITIES			
	Capacity or Size		
Name of Facility	Sq. Ft.	Beds	Location
County Detention Center	30,000		221 Broadway, Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

Operations include photographing, fingerprinting, and booking arrested persons; conducting breathalyzer tests; providing continuous supervision of inmates; providing meals, sanitary facilities and medical care; ensuring maintenance of inmates' rights, and; operating the various court mandated programs for inmates.

The estimated average daily population for FY97 is 71.9 inmates. Estimated bookings for the same time period is 3,521 or 7 per day. There is no further information regarding LOS pending completion of the proposed RFP.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects pending completion of the proposed RFP.

FAIRGROUNDS: CATEGORY B

Provider of Facilities

Lewis and Clark County

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Fairgrounds facilities include an indoor arena, main exhibition hall, livestock barns, exhibit buildings, a large picnic area and a medium sized grandstand. A small pond is also on the site and is used for ice skating in the winter and

a place to feed the ducks in the summer. A race track is also on the site, but due to the uncertainty of its use in the future, this site may become available for some other recreational need.

Fairgrounds Users, Inc., the organization that manages the Fairgrounds, is in the process of developing a long-range plan for the site. Table 37 lists the existing County fairground facilities.

TABLE 37: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY INVENTORY OF FAIRGROUNDS FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size	Location
Lewis & Clark Fairgrounds	149.79	Custer Avenue and Henderson

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time. Fairground Users Inc. is in the process of preparing a master plan.

FIRE: CATEGORY B: Augusta Fire District (Augusta Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Augusta Volunteer Fire Department provides structural fire protection within the Augusta townsite and land along Highways 435, 287, and 21, extending several miles to the southwest, south, and northeast from Augusta.

The Augusta Fire Department also operates a volunteer ambulance service. Persons requiring medical services are typically transported to Great Falls.

Current Facilities

The Fire Department is funded through the Augusta Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the District. Funding for the ambulance service is provided through donations. Table 38 lists the Augusta Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 38: AUGUSTA FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Augusta (FD)	No Information	No Information	No Information

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire:
Baxendale Fire District (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Baxendale Volunteer Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection to approximately 350 residential structures in a 91 square mile area in the southwest portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

The Department also provides first response emergency medical services (EMS), but is not authorized to transport victims. In 1998 the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners established a Countywide Ambulance District to address the coordinated provision of EMS in the County. The County will authorize an ambulance service provider

in the near future. Presently, ambulance service in the Helena Valley Planning Area is provided from Saint Peter's Hospital and Ambulance Service, located in the southeast side of Helena.

Current Facilities

The Baxendale Volunteer Fire Department consists of 20 volunteers. The Fire Department is funded through the Baxendale Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the district. Table 38 lists the Baxendale Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 38: BAXENDALE FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Baxendale (FD)	1	1 Structural Engine 2 Tenders 1 Wildland Engine	Intersection of Blue Cloud Road & Highway 12 West

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire:
Birdseye Fire District (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Birdseye Volunteer Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection in a 26 square mile area in the northwest portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The Birdseye Volunteer Fire Department consists of 16 volunteers. The Fire Department is funded through the Birdseye Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the District. Table 39 lists the Birdseye Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 39: BIRDSEYE FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Birdseye (FD)	1	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender 1 Wildland	Near the intersection of Eagle Ridge Road & Birdseye Road

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 15 calls per year with an average response time of 3 to 10 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 5 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No Capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Canyon Creek Volunteer Fire Department
(Canyon Creek/Marysville Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Canyon Creek Volunteer Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection in an 80 square mile area in the Canyon Creek/Marysville Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The Canyon Creek Volunteer Fire Department consists of 14 volunteers. The Fire Department is funded through the Canyon Creek Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the District. Table 40 lists the Canyon Creek Volunteer Fire Department facilities inventory.

TABLE 40: CANYON CREEK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Canyon Creek (FD)	Equipment is housed on private	2 Engines 1 Wildland Engine	1.5 Miles North East of the Canyon Creek Store on the West Side of Lincoln Road

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 40 calls per year with an average response time of 15 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 12 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Canyon Ferry Fire Service Area
(Canyon Ferry/York Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Canyon Ferry Volunteer Fire Department provides structural fire protection to approximately 440 homes, seasonal cabins, businesses, and 7 campgrounds in the southern portion of the Canyon Ferry/York Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The Canyon Ferry Volunteer Fire Department consists of 26 volunteers. The Fire Department is funded through the Canyon Ferry Fire Service Area with tax assessments on structures that have an assessed value of fifty dollars or more. Table 41 lists the Canyon Ferry Volunteer Fire Department facilities inventory.

TABLE 41: CANYON FERRY FIRE SERVICE AREA INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Canyon Ferry (FSA):	Equipment is housed on private property at 2 locations.	1 Tender 1 Wildland Engine 1 Wildland Engine	1. Across From the Jo Bonner Campground on the East Side of Canyon Ferry Lake 2. Directly Southwest of the Yacht Basin Concession Area on the West Side of Canyon Ferry Lake

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire:
Dearborn Fire Service Area
(Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Dearborn Fire Service Area, a cooperative effort with Cascade County, serves a small portion of the Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area.

Current Facilities

Table 42 lists the Dearborn Fire Service Area facilities inventory.

TABLE 42: DEARBORN FIRE SERVICE AREA INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Dearborn (FSA)	No Info.	No Info.	No Info.

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Eastgate Fire District
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Eastgate Fire Department provides structural fire protection to a seven square mile area in the southeast portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

The Department also provides first response emergency medical services (EMS), but is not authorized to transport victims. In 1998 the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners established a Countywide Ambulance District to address the coordinated provision of EMS in the County. The County will authorize an ambulance service provider in the near future. Presently, ambulance service in the Helena Valley Planning Area is provided from Saint Peter's Hospital and Ambulance Service, located in the southeast side of Helena.

Current Facilities

The Eastgate Fire Department consists of 16 volunteers. The Fire District is funded with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the district. Table 43 lists the Eastgate Fire Department facilities inventory.

TABLE 43: EASTGATE FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Eastgate (FD)	1	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender 1 Squad	Eastgate Subdivision

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 215 calls per year with an average response time of 7 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 3-4 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
East Helena Fire District
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The East Helena Volunteer Fire Department provides fire protection to the City of East Helena.

The Department also provides first response emergency medical services (EMS), but is not authorized to transport victims. In 1998 the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners established a County-wide Ambulance District to address the coordinated provision of EMS in the County. The County will authorize an ambulance service provider in the near future. Presently, ambulance service in the Helena Valley Planning Area is provided from Saint Peter's Hospital and Ambulance Service, located in the southeast side of Helena.

Current Facilities

Table 44 lists the East Helena Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 44: EAST HELENA FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
East Helena (FD)	1	2 Structural Engines	East Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire: East Valley Fire District (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The East Valley Volunteer Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection to a 33 square mile area in the central portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

The Department also provides first response emergency medical services (EMS), but is not authorized to transport victims. In 1998 the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners established a Countywide Ambulance District to address the coordinated provision of EMS in the County. The County will authorize an ambulance service provider in the near future. Presently, ambulance service in the Helena Valley Planning Area is provided from Saint Peter's Hospital and Ambulance Service, located in the southeast side of Helena.

Current Facilities

The East Valley Fire Department consists of 24 volunteers. The Fire District is funded with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the district. Table 45 lists the East Helena Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 45: EAST VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus *	Location
East Valley (FD)	1 2 *Apparatus inventory per station not known	3 Structural Engines 2 Tenders 1 Wildland Engine 1 Squad	Intersection of Tizer Drive and Old York Road LaCasa Grande

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 100 calls per year with an average response time of 7 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 5 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Fort Harrison Fire Department
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Fort Harrison Veterans Administration facility maintains a small paid professional fire department that responds to incidents at the VA hospital and on the military reservation.

Current Facilities

Table 46 lists the Fort Harrison Fire Department facilities inventory.

TABLE 46: FORT HARRISON FIRE DEPARTMENT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES

Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Fort Harrison Fire Department	1		Fort Harrison Veterans Administration Facility

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Lakeside Fire Service Area
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Lakeside Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection to a 65 square mile area in the eastern portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

The Department also provides first response emergency medical services (EMS), but is not authorized to transport victims. In 1998 the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners established a County-wide Ambulance District to address the coordinated provision of EMS in the County. The County will authorize an ambulance service provider in the near future. Presently, ambulance service in the Helena Valley Planning Area is provided from Saint Peter's Hospital and Ambulance Service, located in the southeast side of Helena.

Current Facilities

The Lakeside Fire Department consists of 24 volunteers. Properties within the Service Area are assessed an annual fee for services. Table 47 lists the Lakeside Fire Service Area facilities inventory.

TABLE 47: LAKESIDE FIRE SERVICE AREA INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Lakeside (FSA):	Station 1 Station 2 Station 3	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender 1 Wildland Engine 1 Structural Engine	1. Near Intersection of Lincoln Road East & Hauser Dam Road 2. Lakeside 3. South of the Intersection of Canyon Ferry Road & Spokane Creek Road

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Lewis and Clark County Fire District
(All Areas Not Within A Fire District or Service Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Volunteer Fire Department provides wildland fire protection on private lands in those portions of the County not within a formal fire district or service area. By Montana statute, the Lewis and Clark County Fire Department is only charged

with fighting wildland fires. In practice, the Department will attempt to suppress structural fires and prevent them from becoming wildland fires.

The Sheriff is appointed Rural Fire Warden and is responsible for the operation of the Fire Department. The fire protection area is approximately 800 square miles and includes an estimated 13,000 improved properties. The Department also handles hazardous material spills.

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Volunteer Fire Department consists of 13 volunteers. Wildland fire protection is funded by a tax levied on all property and improvements. Table 48 lists the Lewis and Clark County Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 48: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Lewis & Clark Co. (FD)	1	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender 1 Wildland	County Shop Complex on Cooney Drive

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 67 calls per year with an average response time of 25 minutes within the protection areas that include bulk oil plants, fuel storage areas, businesses, residences, and thousands of acres of wildland areas.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Marysville Fire District
(Canyon Creek/Marysville Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Marysville Volunteer Fire Department provides structural fire protection within the Marysville townsite.

Current Facilities

The Marysville Fire Department is funded through the Marysville Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the district. Table 49 lists the Marysville Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 49: MARYSVILLE FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Marysville (FD)	1	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender	Marysville Townsite

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
West Helena Valley Fire District
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The West Helena Valley Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection in a 50 square mile area in the west-central portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The West Helena Valley Fire department consists of 36 volunteers. The Fire Department is funded through the West Helena Valley Fire District with tax assessments for each qualifying lot within the district. Table 50 lists the West Helena Valley Fire District facilities inventory.

TABLE 50: WEST HELENA VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
W. Helena Valley (FD):	1. Main Station 2. North Hill Station	1 Structural Engine 1 Squad Unit 1 Structural Engine 2 Tenders 1 Wildland Engine	1. Near Intersection of Forestvale Road & North Montana Avenue 2. Intersection of Valley View Road & North Montana Avenue

Level of Service (LOS)

The Department responds to about 500 calls per year with an average response time of 8.5 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 7-8 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire: Westside Fire Service Area (Helena Valley Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The City of Helena Fire Department provides fire protection services under a contractual agreement with the Westside Fire Service area (a three square mile area on the northwest edge of the City).

Current Facilities

Facilities are owned by the City of Helena Fire Department. Properties within the Westside Fire Service Area are assessed an annual fee for services. No information is available regarding the inventory of facilities.

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Wolf Creek/Craig Fire Service Area
(Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Wolf Creek and Craig Volunteer Fire Departments provide structural fire protection to approximately 600 persons in a 200 square mile area within the Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area. The Departments respond to about 85 calls per year with an average response time of 10 to 20 minutes. The Department's desired response time is 6 minutes.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects.

Current Facilities

The Wolf Creek and Craig Volunteer Fire Departments consist of 15 volunteers. The Fire Departments are funded through the Wolf Creek/Craig Fire Service Area (each of the volunteer fire departments is part of the Wolf Creek/Craig Fire Service Area), with tax assessments on structures that have an assessed value of fifty dollars or more. Table 51 lists the Wolf Creek/Craig Fire Service Area facilities inventory.

TABLE 51: WOLF CREEK/CRAIG FIRE SERVICE AREA INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Wolf Creek/Craig FSA	2	1 Squad 2 Structural Engines 2 Tenders 1 Wildland Engine 1 Quick Response Unit	Within Wolf Creek and Craig Townsites

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

**Fire:
York Fire Service Area
(Canyon Ferry/York Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The York Volunteer Fire Department provides structural fire protection in the northern portion of the Canyon Ferry/York Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The Fire Department is funded through the York Fire Service Area with tax assessments on structures that have an assessed value of fifty dollars or more. Table 52 lists the York Fire Service Area facilities inventory.

TABLE 52: YORK FIRE SERVICE AREA INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
York (FSA)	1	1 Structural Engine 1 Tender 1 Wildland Engine	Adjacent to the Community Hall on the York-Nelson Road

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

**Fire:
Helena Regional Airport Fire Training Center
(County-wide)**

Provider of Facilities

The Helena Regional Airport has specially trained personnel and special foaming equipment used in response to aircraft accidents.

Fire response on rural Federal and State lands is coordinated through the Interagency Fire Dispatch Center, located at the airport.

Current Facilities

Table 53 lists the Helena Regional Airport Fire Training Center facilities inventory.

TABLE 53:	HELENA REGIONAL AIRPORT FIRE TRAINING CENTER INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES
------------------	---

Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
Helena Regional Airport:	1	1 Airport Crash Unit	Helena Regional Airport

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS at this time.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

Fire:
**U.S. Forest Service and Department of Natural Resources and
Conservation (County Wide)**

Provider of Facilities

Wildland fire protection is provided by an interagency team consisting of personnel from the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, and the Bureau of Land Management. Response may include personnel and equipment from these agencies, as well as the Lewis and Clark County Fire District.

The interagency team automatically responds to all fires within the planning areas, but are only responsible for wildland fire suppression. The interagency team will assist the local fire departments in structural fires from the outside and supply water when necessary.

Current Facilities

Table 54 lists the U.S. Forest Service and Department of Natural Resources and Conservation facilities inventory.

TABLE 54: INVENTORY OF FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES--U.S. FOREST SERVICE & DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION (DNRC)			
Fire District (FD) or Fire Service Area (FSA)	Stations	Apparatus	Location
U.S. Forest Services		7 Wildland Engines	Various Locations
Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC)		2 Tenders 9 Wildland Engines 1 Airplane	Various Locations
Bureau of Land Management	No Information	No Information	

Level of Service (LOS)

Depending upon fire conditions and severity of the fire, response time can vary from five minutes by helicopter to thirty minutes by fire engine.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT: CATEGORY B**Provider of Facilities**

Lewis and Clark County, provides governmental services to a population of 52,785 (1995) in an area approximately 3,513 square miles. The county seat is located in Helena. A three member Board of County Commissioners is responsible for the operation and management of the County's governmental activities. There are twelve other elected officials.

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County inventory of general government buildings total 77,103 square feet. Tables 55 and 56 lists the County's general government facilities inventory.

TABLE 55: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY: INVENTORY OF COUNTY GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size (sq ft)	Location
City/County Building: Accounting Admin. & Financial Services Elections Extension Services Health: Environmental Information Services	1,120 4,041 1,272 1,054 1,703 1,250	316 N. Park, Helena

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY**GROWTH POLICY: CFP*****Draft: 3/1/02***

Justice Court Motor Vehicle Property Tax Records Sub-total	910 1,051 576 <u>2,535</u> 15,512	
Shops: Public Works Department Weed District Shop Department Road & Bridge Office & Storage Sub-total	980 3,920 6,800 <u>19,739</u> 31,439	3402 Cooney Drive, Helena
Coroner Adm. Coroner Sub-total	204 <u>310</u> 514	316 N. Park, Helena St. Peters Hospital
Disaster & Emergency Services Sub-total	<u>90</u> 90	Law Enforcement Center
Environmental Health Sub-total	<u>1,270</u> 1,270	East Helena
Health: Community Health Services Cooperative Health Clinic Sub-total	5,756 <u>4,384</u> 10,140	Helena Medical Plaza

**TABLE 56: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY:
INVENTORY OF COUNTY GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES**

Name of Facility	Capacity or Size (sq ft)	Location
Road & Bridge (misc. locations) Wolf Creek Garage Augusta Garage & Storage Canyon Ferry Sand Shed Helena Sand Shed	3,000 3,144 1,500 1,600	Frontage Road, Wolf Creek Laura Street, Augusta Approximately 1.25 miles from the Canyon Ferry Road & HWY 284 intersection.

Lincoln Garage & Storage Silver Sand Shed Wilborn Sand Shed Applegate Gravel Pit Sub-total	3,414 2,560 2,200 <u>720</u> 18,138 =====	Stemple Pass Road, Lincoln 1/4 mile NW of Birdseye Road & HWY 279 intersection. HWY 279 & Stemple Pass Road NE corner of Applegate Road & HWY 279.
Total General Government Services	77,103	

Level of Service (LOS)

The County provides the following general government services at the facilities listed above:

1. General government functions of the County include judicial and legal services, public records administration, election services, financial services, planning services, and public school administration.
2. Public works functions include road maintenance, weed control, solid waste services and cemetery services.
3. Other functions include various public health services and extension services.

Other County services, such as law enforcement, nursing home care, etc., are discussed in other sections of this report.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects at this time.

LAW ENFORCEMENT: CATEGORY B

Provider of Facilities

The Lewis and Clark County Sheriff Department provides law enforcement to approximately 27,500 persons in the County within the greater Helena area, Wolf Creek, Augusta, Lincoln, Craig, and the recreation areas that include Canyon Ferry, Holter, and Hauser Reservoirs. The Patrol Division also assists the Civil and Warrants Divisions in Helena.

Current Facilities

Table 57 lists the County's law enforcement facilities inventory. Specific information will be available pending completion of the County's Information Services Study.

TABLE 57: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY INVENTORY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size (sq. ft.)	Location
Sheriff Administration: Helena Lincoln Augusta Total		221 Breckenridge, Helena Lincoln Augusta

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS pending completion of the County's Information Services Study available.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No capital projects pending completion of the County's Information Services Study.

LIBRARY: CATEGORY B**Provider of Facilities**

The Lewis and Clark Library System is a joint City/County activity. The Joint Library Board maintains three facilities that serve the County. The Main Library in Helena, serves the entire County. The satellite library in Lincoln services Lincoln, Ovando, and Helmville. The population served by the Lincoln Library varies from 1,800 during the winter months to 3,500 during the summer months. The satellite library in Augusta serves a population of approximately 450 people.

Current Facilities

The Lewis and Clark Library System is staffed by 24 full and part time employees. The library system contains approximately 188,630 volumes and items in the three library facilities.

Table 58 lists the Lewis and Clark County library system facilities inventory.

TABLE 58: LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY INVENTORY OF LIBRARY FACILITIES		
Name of Facility	Capacity or Size (sq ft)	Location
Augusta Library	783	
Helena Library	34,530	120 S. Last Chance Gulch, Helena
Lincoln Library	1,632	Lincoln
Total	36,945	

Level of Service (LOS)

The **Current LOS** provided by the Lewis and Clark Library System is 666.77 library building square feet per 1,000 population. The current LOS is based on the existing inventory of library buildings divided by the 1999 Countywide population.

The **Proposed LOS** of 627.54 square feet per 1,000 population assumes no additional library building space through the 5-year CFP planning period. Therefore the existing inventory is sufficient to serve the County's needs through the year 2004.

Table 59 calculates the requirements for library facilities for each of the levels of service (current and proposed). The current LOS would require 2,309 additional square feet of library facilities. The proposed LOS does not require additional capacity through the year 2004.

TABLE 59: LEWIS AND CLARK LIBRARY SYSTEM: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL FACILITY REQUIREMENTS				
Library Buildings Current LOS = 666.77 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Square Feet Required @ 0.666770 per Capita	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/ (Deficiency)
1999	55,409	36,945	36,945	0
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr.	3,463	2,309		(2,309)
2004 Total	58,872	39,254	36,945	(2,309)
Library Buildings Proposed LOS = 627.54 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
(1) Time Period	(2) County-wide Population	(3) Square Feet Required @ 0.627540 per Capita	(4) Current Inventory	(5) Net Surplus/ (Deficiency)
1999	55,409	34,771	36,945	2,174
2000 - 2004: 5 Yr.	3,463	2,174		(2,174)
2004 Total	58,872	36,945	36,945	0
CAPACITY PROJECTS:				
No Capital Projects				

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

The Lewis and Clark County library system facilities include three (3) capital projects at a cost of \$620,300. Projects that will provide additional capacity (i.e., square feet of building) are listed first, followed by non-capacity projects (i.e., for renovation,

replacement, and repairs to existing facilities, and other types of improvements that do not provide new capacity).

Each capital improvement project is named, and briefly described. Project locations are specified in the name or description of the project. The cost for each of the next five fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars (\$1,000). All cost data is in current dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the annual review and update of the Capital Facilities Plan.

The proposed capital facilities and financing plan is shown in Appendix M.

Public Schools: Category B

Augusta School District #45 (Augusta Planning Area)

Provider of Facilities

The Augusta School District #45 serves most of the K-12 students within the Augusta Planning Area. (The Wolf Creek School District covers a small part of the southwest portion of the Planning Area.)

Current Facilities

The District's facilities include 3 schools--1 elementary, 1 middle school, and 1 high school. Table 60 lists the Augusta School District #45 facilities inventory.

TABLE 60: AUGUSTA SCHOOL DISTRICT #45: INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
Augusta School District #45			
Augusta Elementary (K-6)		63	322 N Broadway, Augusta

Augusta Middle School (7-8)		18	322 N Broadway, Augusta
Augusta High School (9-12)		48	322 N Broadway, Augusta

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information.

**Public Schools:
Canyon Creek School District #4
(Canyon Creek/Marysville Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Canyon Creek School District #4 serves the K-8 students within the Canyon Creek/Marysville planning area as well as portions of the Birdseye area located south of the planning area. Parents who live more than three miles from the school and who are not provided transportation by the district can choose to enroll their children in the adjacent school district, if space is available. High School students from the Canyon Creek/Marysville Planning Area attend Capital High School in Helena (District #1).

Current Facilities

The District's facilities consist of one school. Table 61 lists the Canyon Creek School District #4 facilities inventory.

TABLE 61: CANYON CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT #4: INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
Canyon Creek School District #4			
Canyon Creek School (K-8)		10	Duffy Lane 1/2 Mile East of Lincoln Road In Canyon Creek

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

**Public Schools:
Craig School District #25
(Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Craig School District #25 serves a portion of the K-6 students within the Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area. Middle and High School students from the Planning Area attend school in the Helena School District.

Current Facilities

The District's facilities consist of one (1) school. Table 62 lists the Craig School District #25 facilities inventory.

TABLE 62: CRAIG SCHOOL DISTRICT #25: INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
Craig School District #25			
Craig Elementary School (K-6)		10	Wolf Creek

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

Public Schools: East Helena School District #9 (Helena Valley & Canyon Ferry/York Planning Areas)

Provider of Facilities

The East Helena School District serves the K-8 students within the Canyon Ferry/York Planning Area, and a portion of the Helena Valley Planning Area. High School students from the Planning Areas attend school in the Helena School District.

Current Facilities

The East Helena District #9 facilities include two elementary schools and one middle school. Table 63 lists the District's facilities inventory.

TABLE 63: EAST HELENA SCHOOL DISTRICT #9: INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
East Helena School District #9			
Eastgate School (K-4)		344	4010 Gradestake, East Helena
Radley Elementary School (K-5)		398	226 East Clinton Street, East Helena
East Helena Middle School (6-8)		398	East Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

**Public Schools:
Helena School District #1
(Helena Valley; Canyon Creek/Marysville;
Canyon Ferry/York Planning Areas)**

Provider of Facilities

The Helena School District #1 serves the majority of the K-8 students in the City of Helena and the Helena Valley. The District serves all grades 9-12 students in three

additional Districts: Canyon Creek District #4; Craig District #25, East Helena District #9, Kessler District #2; and Wolf Creek District #13.

Current Facilities

The Helena District #1 facilities include twelve (12) elementary schools, two(2) middle schools, and two (2) high schools. Table 64 lists the District's facilities inventory.

TABLE 64: HELENA SCHOOL DISTRICT #1: INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
Helena School District #1			
<i>Elementary Schools:</i> Broadwater School (PK-5)		277	<i>Elementary Schools:</i> 900 Hollins, Helena
Bryant School (K-5)		226	1529 Boulder, Helena
Central School (K-5)		316	402 North Warren, Helena
Four Georgians School (K-5)		497	555 Custer Avenue, Helena
Hawthorne School (K-5)		248	430 Madison Avenue, Helena
Jefferson School (K-5)		228	1023 Broadway, Helena
Jim Darcy School (K-5)		259	900 Lincoln Road East, Helena
Lincoln School (K-5)		79	1325 Poplar, Helena
Ray Bjork School		118	1600 8th Avenue, Helena
Rossiter School (PK-5)		449	1497 Sierra Road East, Helena
Smith School (K-5)		263	2320 5th Avenue
Warren School (K-5)		<u>270</u>	2690 York Road
Elementary Total		3,230	<i>Middle Schools:</i> 1200 Knight, Helena
<i>Middle Schools:</i> C R Anderson Middle School (6-8)		1,039	1025 North Rodney, Helena
Helena Middle School		<u>887</u>	<i>High Schools</i> 100 Valley Drive, Helena
Middle School Total		1,926	1300 Billings Avenue, Helena
<i>High Schools:</i> Capital High School (9-12)		1,354	
Helena High School (9-12)		<u>1,652</u>	
High School Total		3,006	

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

**Public Schools:
Kessler School District #2
(Helena Valley Planning Area)**

Provider of Facilities

The Kessler School District #2 serves the K-6 grade students in the southwest part of the Helena Valley Planning Area. Students in grades 7-12 attend school in the Helena School District #1.

Current Facilities

The Kessler School District #2 facilities consist of one (1) elementary school. Table 65 lists the District's facilities inventory.

TABLE 65: KESSLER SCHOOL DISTRICT #2 INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location

Kessler School District #2			
Kessler Elementary (K-6)		307	2420 Choteau Street, Helena

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

**Public Schools:
Wolf Creek School District #13
(Wolf Creek/Craig and Augusta Planning Areas)**

Provider of Facilities

The Wolf Creek School District #13 serves a portion of the K-6 students within the Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area. Middle and High School students from the Wolf Creek/Craig Planning Area attend school in the Helena School District. The Wolf Creek District also includes a small part of the southwest portion of the Augusta Planning Area.

Current Facilities

The District's facilities consist of one (1) school. Table 66 lists the Wolf Creek School District #13 facilities inventory.

TABLE 66: WOLF CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT #13 INVENTORY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES			
	Capacity/Enrollment		
Name of Facility	Capacity	Enrollment (1997-98)	Location
Wolf Creek School District #13			
Wolf Creek Elementary		16	Wolf Creek

Level of Service (LOS)

There is no information regarding LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

No information available.

APPENDICES